

Party Identity and the Evaluation of Political Candidates

Anna Zabinski

Georgia State University

Author Note

Anna Zabinski, Department of Political Science, Georgia State University.

This paper was written as a Senior Honors Thesis under the advisement of Dr. T. Bolsen.

Dr. Toby Bolsen, Thesis Advisor

Date: _____

Dr. Sarah Cook, Honors College Associate Dean

Date: _____

Abstract

Our political attitudes shape our perceptions of the world. It has been suggested to use Social Identity Theory (SIT) as a framework within a political context. Specifically, SIT can be used to explain the preference for in-group members who share a political identity and dislike of out-group members who do not. Given the literature using SIT as a framework and that political attitudes can bias perceptions, a person's political identity can impact the evaluation of a candidate. A total of 232 undergraduate students from Georgia State University completed a questionnaire evaluating a political candidate that was either labeled as a Republican, Democratic, or without a label. The results showed a significant difference in the evaluation of the candidate depending on whether or not the participant shared the same party identity. This supports the notion that the party label alone can have an impact on candidate evaluations. The preference for in-group members and distrust of out-group members supports using SIT as a model explaining this phenomenon within a political context.

Party Identity and the Evaluation of Political Candidates

Attitudes & Party Identity

Our attitudes shape our perceptions of the world. Partisanship acts as an attitude shaping our views towards people, issues, and objects. It is stable and relatively unchanging over time (Greene, 2002). Understanding partisan identity is as equally important to understand as other group identities individuals have because it behaves in a similar way. Racial, ethnic, and religious identities all tie individuals to a group just like partisan identity does (Campbell, et al, 1960). Partisan identity allows for individuals to distort perceptions of their in-group. Specifically, it allows for individuals to form more favorable perceptions of their in-group and negative perceptions of the out-group. An increase in polarization and animosity between political parties has been increasing since the 1960s (Haidt & Hetherington, 2012; Iyengar, et al, 2012). This is partially due to the increase in technology and the ability for individuals to act out confirmation bias, seeking information that confirms their beliefs and tuning out information that does not (Iyengar, et al, 2012).

It has been suggested to use Social Identity Theory (SIT) as a framework within a political context to better explain party identity (Greene, 2004; Greene, 2005). SIT explains how an individual's self-concept is tied to their perceived group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Thus, SIT explains the preference for in-group members. In addition, SIT states that individuals place an emotional value on these group memberships, explaining in-group bias. Although SIT is rooted within social psychology, there is a great advantage of applying it towards political science. The benefits of using SIT as a model for partisan identity include providing a richer theoretical background to explain the psychological attachment and group belongingness associated with the group (Greene, 2002; Theodoridis, 2015). In addition, it can provide a better

explanation for individual behavior as it related to group attachment and is a better predictor for individual behavior (Greene, 2002). SIT explains the bipolarity within American politics, the us-versus-them attitude. Importantly, SIT is not intended to replace current theoretical frameworks, but only to expand on them. SIT can be used to explain the preference for in-group members who share a political identity and the stronger dislike for out-group members who do not.

Power of the Party Label

Although voters should evaluate each candidate individually, it takes a lot of work so many voters rely on other short cuts in order to quickly identify which candidate they prefer. One of these shortcuts is attractiveness. First impressions are very important and images of the physiognomy of politicians' faces have been studied in order to identify what features are more desirable in a candidate (Budesheim & DePaolo, 1994; Hellweg, Pfau, & Brydon 1992; Rosenberg, et al, 1986; Keating, et al, 1999). Even more interestingly, some studies have shown that individuals can identify out-group members simply from a photograph with greater accuracy than would simply be expected due to chance (Olivola & Todorov, 2010; Samochowiec et al, 2010). Wanke, Samochowiec, and Landwehr (2013) suggest that this hypersensitivity to out-group members has an evolutionary basis. It is more dangerous to trust someone who can harm us than distrusting someone who is harmless. In the American political context, the two parties have become so polarized the past few decades that two separate cultures have resulted and individuals can identify their differences. A study by Iyengar & Westwood (2014), found that out-group animosity and distrust in the political sphere has become ingrained and automatic. All of these studies provide support for attractiveness as a shortcut and support for identifying out-group members; however, data on the effects party labels have as a shortcut is even more compelling.

In an interesting neural study by Kaplan, et al (2007), participants underwent an fMRI and were shown the pictures of members of their political party (in-group members) as well as opposing political party members (out-group members). When shown the pictures of out-group members, there were significant changes in the prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate (cognitive regions of the brain) as well as insula and anterior temporal lobes (emotional regions of the brain) when compared to the pictures of in-group members. This study captured, on a neurological level, the emotional and biological responses to expressing positive feelings towards in-group members and negative feelings towards out-group members. Furthermore, the study found that the stronger the negative emotion towards an out-group member, the stronger the positive emotion towards an in-group member. In addition, a study by Young, Ratner, & Fazio (2013) found that individuals remember the faces of out-group politicians as less attractive than those of in-group politicians. Similarly, a study by Ratner, et al (2014) found that in-group faces were rated as more trustworthy in an economic game and were rated as more trusting, caring, intelligent, and attractive overall. Duck et al (1995) found in-group members perceived themselves as less vulnerable to media propaganda than out-group members. In addition, in-group members felt that out-group members were less likely to listen to messages that countered their views and would only listen to messages supporting their political attitudes. Furthermore, in a study by Bolsen, Druckman, and Cook (2014), participants' opinion formation on environmental policies was related to whether or not it had the endorsement of the in-group or out-group party. Thus, the party label itself can act as a shortcut in forming attitudes and opinions towards faces and policies.

Given the literature on using SIT as a framework and the research supporting that political attitudes can bias perceptions, a person's political identity can impact the evaluation of a

candidate when only an image is presented. This study was conducted in order to examine the link between party labels and the evaluation of political candidates. The study tested (1) whether or not party affiliation can impact the evaluation of a candidate and (2) if people view candidates more favorably if they are from the same party (in-group), but not as much as they dislike candidates from the opposing party (out-group). Thus, supporting the use of SIT as a working framework within political science. The hypotheses were (1) that individual party affiliation does impact the evaluation of a candidate and (2) that in-group favoritism of a candidate would not be as strong as out-group disliking.

Method

Participants

A total sample of 246 students was obtained from Georgia State University. Of that, participants who did not complete all parts of the survey were removed from the data sample. This left a sample of 232. There were 164 females, 66 males, and 2 participants preferred not to answer. There were 41 Caucasian, 76 African-American, 34 Latino/Hispanic, 50 Asian, 3 Middle Eastern, 1 Native American/ Pacific Islander, 21 Other, and 2 participants preferred not to answer. The age of the participants ranged from 18-56. A breakdown of participant demographics within each condition is listed in *Table 1*. In order to take part in the study, participants had to be registered with the Political Science SONA system and also had to be over the age of 18. This age was selected because it is the age citizens earn the right to vote. For SONA recruitment text, refer to *Appendix A*. The survey was administered via Qualtrics and could be taken anywhere with Internet access on a PC, tablet, or smart phone. Participants chose to participate in this study from a list of studies for class credit.

Procedure

In this study participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (control/no label, Republican, Democrat) and complete a Qualtrics survey online. Participants were told the study focused on the influence of first impressions on the character of political candidates. This mild deception was necessary in order to prevent participant bias and have participants alter their answers knowing that this study was actually about how their party identity influences their evaluations of a political candidate. Participants first completed a series of brief demographic questions and questions about their party identity. After, participants were shown an image of a political candidate and were told that he was either a Republican, a Democrat, or not told his party affiliation. Then, participants evaluated the character of the candidate. The survey in its entirety consists of four parts: demographic questions, participant party identification, candidate evaluation (either a control, republican, or democrat condition), and debriefing. During the debriefing portion, participants were told the focus of the study was the impact of party affiliation on candidate evaluations and not about the first impressions of a candidate's character based off of an image. This was a between subjects research design.

Materials

Data collected from this study was examined to determine if the manipulation of party affiliation (Independent Variable) made a significant difference on the evaluation of the candidate (Dependent Variable). Participant party affiliation was measured using three party identity questions on 7-point scales. During data analysis, the 7-point scales for political identity and ideology were collapsed so that weak, moderate, and strong partisanship were in the same group. This was because previous research has shown that there is little difference between weak partisan leaners and strong partisans' attachment to the group (Greene, 1999). In other words, there is little difference of whether someone leans right or feels strongly Republican, both types

of people feel a sense of attachment to the Republican party. The evaluation of the candidate was measured using 7-point bipolar scales to assess character attributions taken from Keating et al (1999): Submissive-dominant, weak-strong, unattractive-attractive, naïve-cunning, dishonest-honest, and heartless-compassionate. The image used to depict the political candidate was Senator Martin Heinrich of New Mexico. Previous research examines the impact race and gender have on candidate evaluations when little information is presented (McDermott 1997; McDermott 1998). Therefore, Senator Heinrich was chosen because he is an average-looking white, male senator. Senator Heinrich is younger than the average senator, but that was to control for any ageism against elderly politicians. See *Appendix B. Conditions & Wording* for each condition's survey in its entirety.

Results

Participants in the Republican and Democrat conditions were divided and compared to the control condition by participant party identity. Thus, the following groups' means across candidate character evaluations were compared to the control: Democrats in the Democrat condition, Democrats in the Republican condition, Republicans in the Republican condition, Republicans in the Republican condition, Independents in the Democrat condition, and Independents in the Republican condition. Democrats in the Republican condition found the candidate to be more naïve, less attractive, and were less likely to vote for him. Republicans in the Republican condition found the candidate to be more naïve and more dishonest. Independents in the Democrat condition found the candidate to be weaker. Independents in the Republican condition found the candidate to be more naïve, dishonest, less compassionate, unattractive, and were less likely to vote for him. There were no differences between the Democrats in the Democrat in condition and Republicans in the Democrat condition. See *Tables 2*.

Additional t-tests were run comparing participants within the same party affiliation, but across conditions. When compared to Democrats in the Democrat condition, Democrats in the Republican condition found the candidate to be more naïve, more dishonest, less compassionate, less attractive, more submissive, and were less likely to vote for him. There were no significant differences between Republicans in the Republican and Democrat conditions. When compared to Independents in the Democrat condition, Independents in the Republican condition found the candidate to be less submissive. See *Tables 3-5*.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to test (1) whether or not party affiliation can impact the evaluation of a candidate and (2) if people view candidates more favorably if they are from the same party, thus supporting the use of SIT as a working framework within political science. The hypotheses were (1) that individual party affiliation does impact the evaluation of a candidate and (2) that it depends on whether or not the candidate is from the same party (in-group) or not (out-group). Overall, the results support both hypotheses. To test hypothesis (1) the means across conditions were compared via t-tests, see *Table 1*. There was ample evidence to suggest that party affiliation can impact the evaluation of a candidate. There was varying support across conditions with the strongest support coming from Democrats in the Republican condition and Independents in the Republican condition. Most differences in character attribution across conditions were in naivety, attractiveness, and likelihood to vote. Specifically, support depended upon on whether or not the candidate is from the same or opposing party as the individual. The Republican participants' data did not support the hypothesis and no differences were found between Republicans in the Republican and Democrat condition. This can be explained by the small Republican sample size. As was found in previous studies, the party label can act as a

shortcut in making evaluations. One implication of this finding may be that party polarization has become so intense in American politics that the power of the label is stronger than the actual platform of a candidate. There were a few problems and limitations in this study. The sample consisted of undergraduate students and although Georgia State University provides a diverse sample in ethnic background and some variation in age, most participants were between 18 and 20 years old. Furthermore, being an urban school, the number of Republican participants was too small to really find much support. Moreover, anything that was found to be significant and did not support previous research can be explained with the fact that it was such a small sample in comparison to the Democrat and Independent sample sizes.

Future research should be directed towards applying SIT in predicting behavior due to partisanship. Another line of research should be in examining Independents as a group. Independents are commonly left out of data analysis because they represent such a small percentage of American politics; however, with the growing polarization of the Republican and Democratic parties, it is possible the number of Independents can grow as more Americans become distrustful of the current major parties. It would be interesting to see whether or not SIT can be applying to Independent's behavior. It is possible that the group is too small or that their culture is not as strongly developed as the Republicans and Democrats, but it would be worthy of an investigation.

This study attempted to link the party a candidate runs under to the candidate's character evaluation. The data obtained from this study assessed the impact which party labels have on candidate evaluations. The significant differences between the evaluations of the candidate's character based solely upon the label given, can attest to the power of the party label. Additionally, the data confirms that participants favor candidates that are members of their in-

group, but not as much as they dislike members of the out-group. Thus, these results support the use of Social Identity Theory as a working model within political science.

References

- Bolsen, T., Druckman, J. N., & Cook, F. L. (2014). The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion. *Political Behavior*, 36(2), 235-262. doi:10.1007/s11109-013-9238-0
- Budesheim, T. & DePaolo, S. (1994). Beauty or the beast? The effects of appearance, personality, and issue information on evaluations of political candidates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 339-348.
- Campbell, Angus, Converse, Philip, Miller, Warren, and Stokes, Donald (1960). *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Duck, Julie, Hogg, Michael, and Terry, Deborah (1995). Me, us and them: political identification and the third-person effect in the (1993) Australian federal election. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 25, 195–215.
- Greene, S. (1999). Understanding party identification: A social identity approach. *Political Psychology*, 20(2), 393-403. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00150
- Greene, S. (2002). The social-psychological measurement of partisanship. *Political Behavior*, 24(3), 171-197. doi:10.1023/A:1021859907145
- Greene, S. (2004). Social identity theory and party identification. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(1), 136-153.

- Greene, S. (2005). The structure of partisan attitudes: Reexamining partisan dimensionality and ambivalence. *Political Psychology*, 26(5), 809-822. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00445.x
- Haidt, J & Hetherington, M 2012. Look how far we've come apart. The New York Times.
- Hellweg, S., Pfau, M., & Brydon, S. (1992). *Televised presidential debates: Advocacy in contemporary America*. New York: Praeger.
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3), 405-431. doi:10.1093/poq/nfs038
- Iyengar, S. & Westwood, S. J. (2014). Fear and loathing across party lines: New evidence on group polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 69(3), 690-707.
- McDermott, M. (1997). Voting cues in low-information elections: Candidate gender as a social information variable in contemporary United States elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41, 270-283.
- McDermott, M. (1998). Race and gender cues in low-information elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51, 895-918.
- Olivola, C. Y., & Todorov, A. (2010). Elected in 100 milliseconds: Appearance-based trait inferences and voting. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 34, 83-110. doi: 10.1007/s10919-009-0082-1.
- Ratner, K. G., Dotsch, R. Wigboldus, D. H. J., van Knippenberg, A. & Amodio, D. M. (2014). Visualizing minimal ingroup and outgroup faces: Implications for impressions, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106(6), 897-911. Doi: 10.1037/a0036498
- Rosenberg, S., Bohan, L., McCafferty, P. & Harris, K. (1986). The image and the vote: The

- effect of candidate presentation on voter preference. *American Journal of Political Science*, 30, 108-127.
- Samochowiec, J., Wanke, M., & Fiedler, K. (2010). Political ideology at face value. *Social Psychology and Personality Science*, 1, 206-213.
- Tajfel, Henri, and Turner, John C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of Inter- group Relations*, pp. 7–24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Theodoridis, A. G. (2015). *It's my party: Partisan intensity through the lens of implicit identity*. Working paper.
- Wanke, M., Samochowiec, J., & Landwehr, J. (2013). Facial politics: Political judgment based on looks. In J. P. Forgas, K. Fiedler & C. Sedikides (Eds.), *Social thinking and interpersonal behavior*. (pp. 143-160). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Young, A. I., Ratner, K. G., & Fazio, R. H. (2014). Political attitudes bias the mental representation of a presidential candidate's face. *Psychological Science*, 25(2), 503-510.
Doi: 10.1177/0956797613510717

Table 1. *Sample Demographics Between Conditions*

This table shows the breakdown of demographics across conditions.

	Democrat Condition <i>n</i> =76	Republican Condition <i>n</i> =75	Control <i>n</i> =76
Gender	Female 53 Male 23 Prefer not to Answer -	Female 59 Male 17 Prefer not to Answer 1	Female 49 Male 26 Prefer not to Answer 1
Age	Mean 21.76 Median 19 Mode 18 Range 18-56	Mean 19.23 Median 19 Mode 18 Range 18-30	Mean 20.16 Median 19 Mode 18 Range 18-39
Race/ Ethnicity	Caucasian 13 African American 29 Latino/Hispanic 12 Asian 12 Middle Eastern - Native American/Pacific Islander 1 Other 7 Prefer not to Answer 2	Caucasian 16 African American 19 Latino/Hispanic 14 Asian 19 Middle Eastern 1 Native American/Pacific Islander - Other 6 Prefer not to Answer 2	Caucasian 12 African American 27 Latino/Hispanic 7 Asian 19 Middle Eastern 2 Native American/Pacific Islander - Other 8 Prefer not to Answer 1
Party Identity	Democrat 49 Republican 8 Independent 19	Democrat 48 Republican 11 Independent 16	Democrat 46 Republican 9 Independent 21

General Note: Each number represents the number of participants in that condition.

Table 2. *Means Across Conditions*

This table lists the means for each character attribution across conditions. Higher means denote more positive traits in the pairings (weak-strong, naïve-cunning, dishonest-honest, heartless-compassionate, unattractive-attractive, submissive-dominant, and unlikely-likely to vote).

Variable / Treatment Group	Democrats in Democrat Condition <i>n</i> =49	Democrats in Republican Condition <i>n</i> =48	Republicans in Democrat Condition <i>n</i> =8	Republicans in Republican Condition <i>n</i> =11	Independents in Democrat Condition <i>n</i> =19	Independents in Republican Condition <i>n</i> =18	Control <i>n</i> =76
Weak	4.326	4.1875	3.875	4.636364	4*	4.11	4.36
Naive	4.3877	3.29**	5	2.45**	4.37	2.94**	4.21
Honest	4.65	3.96	4	3.82*	4	3.5**	4.32
Compassion	4.88	4.35	5	4.82	4.26	4.06*	4.49
Attractive	4.78	3.71**	5.38	4.82	4.42	3.56**	4.62
Vote	4.04	2.65*	3	4.45	3.89	3.61	3.61
Submissive	4.20	3.81	4.25	4.18	3.89	4.67	4.14

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 3. *Means Between Democrats*

This table shows compares the means for each character attribution made by Democrats.

Variable/ Treatment Group	Democrats in Democrat Condition <i>n</i> =49	Democrats in Republican Condition <i>n</i> =48
Weak	4.33	4.19
Naive**	4.39	3.29
Honest**	4.65	3.96
Compassion**	4.88	4.35
Attractive**	4.78	3.71
Vote**	4.04	2.63
Submissive*	4.20	3.81

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 4. *Means Between Republicans*

This table shows compares the means for each character attribution made by Republicans.

Variable/ Treatment Group	Republicans in Democrat Condition <i>n</i> =8	Republicans in Republican Condition <i>n</i> =11
Weak	3.88	4.64
Naive	5	2.45
Honest	4	3.82
Compassion	5	4.82
Attractive	5.38	4.82
Vote	3	4.45
Submissive	4.25	4.18

No significant differences.

Table 5. *Means Between Independents*

This table shows compares the means for each character attribution made by Independents.

Variable/ Treatment Group	Independents in Democrat Condition <i>n=19</i>	Independents in Republican Condition <i>n=18</i>
Weak	4	4.11
Naive	4.37	2.94
Honest	4	3.5
Compassion	4.26	4.06
Attractive	4.42	3.56
Vote	3.89	3.61
Submissive**	3.89	4.67

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Appendix A. SONA Recruitment Text

This is the recruitment text as it appeared on SONA. This study was administered via SONA and students chose to participate from a list of available studies.

Title: Party Identification and the Evaluation of Political Candidates

Principal Investigator: Dr. Toby Bolsen

Student Principal Investigator: Ms. Anna Zabinski

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of the study is to investigate the influence initial judgments of a political candidate have on evaluations of their character. You are invited to participate because you are a student over the age of 18 at Georgia State University taking a political science course. Up to 250 participants will be recruited for this study. Participation will require up to thirty minutes of your time over the course of one sitting. This study will be presented in a survey format and can be taken from any computer, tablet, or smartphone device with internet access.

Appendix B. Conditions & Wording

These are the questions presented to participants via Qualtrics. The Political Identity and Candidate Confirmation & Conclusion questions were presented to everyone as well as the Debriefing statement.

*Across all conditions, questions about the candidate's character were randomized to control for order effects. *How likely are you to vote for the candidate?* was always presented last.

Political Identity

Generally speaking, which of the options on the scale to the right best describes your party identification?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Strong</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Independent</i>	<i>Independent</i>	<i>Independent</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Strong</i>
<i>Democrat</i>	<i>Democrat</i>	<i>Democrat</i>		<i>Republican</i>	<i>Republican</i>	<i>Republican</i>

How important is your party identification (or your identification as an Independent) to you?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Extremely</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Unimportant</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Extremely</i>
<i>Unimportant</i>	<i>Unimportant</i>				<i>Important</i>	<i>Important</i>

Which point on this scale best describes your political views?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very</i>	<i>Mostly</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Mostly</i>	<i>Very</i>
<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Liberal</i>	<i>Liberal</i>		<i>Conservative</i>	<i>Conservative</i>	<i>Conservative</i>

Control Condition*

This is a political candidate running for office.



*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How submissive or dominant is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Submissive	Submissive	Slightly Submissive	Neither	Slightly Dominant	Dominant	Very Dominant

*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How weak or strong is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Weak	Weak	Slightly Weak	Neither Weak nor Strong	Slightly Strong	Strong	Very Strong

*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How naïve or cunning is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Naïve	Naïve	Slightly Naïve	Neither Naïve nor Cunning	Slightly Cunning	Cunning	Very Cunning

*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How honest or dishonest is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Honest	Honest	Slightly Honest	Neither Honest nor Dishonest	Slightly Dishonest	Dishonest	Very Dishonest

*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How compassionate or heartless is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Compassionate	Compassionate	Slightly Compassionate	Neither Compassionate nor Heartless	Slightly Heartless	Heartless	Very Heartless

*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How attractive or unattractive is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Attractive	Attractive	Slightly Attractive	Neither Attractive	Slightly Unattractive	Unattractive	Very Unattractive

nor
Unattractive

*Evaluate the candidate on the following scale:
How likely are you to vote for this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Highly Unlikely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Slightly Unlikely</i>	<i>Neither Unlikely nor Likely</i>	<i>Slightly Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Very Likely</i>

Republican Condition*

This is a Republican political candidate running for office.



*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How submissive or dominant is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very Submissive</i>	<i>Submissive</i>	<i>Slightly Submissive</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Slightly Dominant</i>	<i>Dominant</i>	<i>Very Dominant</i>

*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How weak or strong is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Slightly Weak</i>	<i>Neither Weak nor Strong</i>	<i>Slightly Strong</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Very Strong</i>

*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How naïve or cunning is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very Naïve</i>	<i>Naïve</i>	<i>Slightly Naïve</i>	<i>Neither Naïve nor Cunning</i>	<i>Slightly Cunning</i>	<i>Cunning</i>	<i>Very Cunning</i>

*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How honest or dishonest is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very Honest</i>	<i>Honest</i>	<i>Slightly Honest</i>	<i>Neither Honest nor Dishonest</i>	<i>Slightly Dishonest</i>	<i>Dishonest</i>	<i>Very Dishonest</i>

*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How compassionate or heartless is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very Compassionate</i>	<i>Compassionate</i>	<i>Slightly Compassionate</i>	<i>Neither Compassionate nor Heartless</i>	<i>Slightly Heartless</i>	<i>Heartless</i>	<i>Very Heartless</i>

*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How attractive or unattractive is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Very Attractive</i>	<i>Attractive</i>	<i>Slightly Attractive</i>	<i>Neither Attractive nor Unattractive</i>	<i>Slightly Unattractive</i>	<i>Unattractive</i>	<i>Very Unattractive</i>

*Evaluate the Republican candidate on the following scale:
How likely are you to vote for this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
<i>Highly Unlikely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Slightly Unlikely</i>	<i>Neither Unlikely nor Likely</i>	<i>Slightly Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Very Likely</i>

Democrat Condition*

This is a Democratic political candidate running for office.



*Evaluate the Democratic candidate on the following scale:
How submissive or dominant is this candidate?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very Submissive</i>	<i>Submissive</i>	<i>Slightly Submissive</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Slightly Dominant</i>	<i>Dominant</i>	<i>Very Dominant</i>

*Evaluate the Democratic candidate on the following scale:
How weak or strong is this candidate?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Slightly Weak</i>	<i>Neither Weak nor Strong</i>	<i>Slightly Strong</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Very Strong</i>

*Evaluate the Democratic candidate on the following scale:
How naïve or cunning is this candidate?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very Naïve</i>	<i>Naïve</i>	<i>Slightly Naïve</i>	<i>Neither Naïve nor Cunning</i>	<i>Slightly Cunning</i>	<i>Cunning</i>	<i>Very Cunning</i>

*Evaluate the Democratic candidate on the following scale:
How honest or dishonest is this candidate?*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very Honest</i>	<i>Honest</i>	<i>Slightly Honest</i>	<i>Neither Honest nor Dishonest</i>	<i>Slightly Dishonest</i>	<i>Dishonest</i>	<i>Very Dishonest</i>

*Evaluate the Democratic candidate on the following scale:
How compassionate or heartless is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Compassionate	Compassionate	Slightly Compassionate	Neither Compassionate nor Heartless	Slightly Heartless	Heartless	Very Heartless

*Evaluate the Democratic candidate on the following scale:
How attractive or unattractive is this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Very Attractive	Attractive	Slightly Attractive	Neither Attractive nor Unattractive	Slightly Unattractive	Unattractive	Very Unattractive

*Evaluate the Democratic Candidate on the following scale:
How likely are you to vote for this candidate?*

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Highly Unlikely	Unlikely	Slightly Unlikely	Neither Unlikely nor Likely	Slightly Likely	Likely	Very Likely

Candidate Confirmation and Conclusion

What political party was the candidate running under?

<u>Republican</u>	<u>Democrat</u>	<u>Unsure</u>
-------------------	-----------------	---------------

Did you recognize the political candidate prior to completing this survey?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
------------	-----------

Debriefing

Thank you for your participation in this study. As mentioned in the Consent form you agreed to upon continuing to completing this survey, not everything you were told in this study was true. Firstly, the political candidate pictured is a real Senator representing the state of New Mexico named Martin Heinrich and he is not currently running for office. Secondly, in the beginning of this study you were told this would be a study about first impressions. This study was actually about the influence party labels have on candidate evaluations. You were in one of three conditions; a control with no party label, a Republican party label, or Democrat party label. By altering the party Senator Heinrich was running for office under, we can better identify the impact that label has on the evaluation of his character. In reality Senator Heinrich is a Democrat.

Knowing what this study was truly about, can we still use your data?

Yes

No